

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-7693

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JAMES ALLEN LINDNER,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 00-6161

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

JAMES ALLEN LINDNER,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Asheville. Lacy H. Thornburg, District Judge. (CR-97-308, CA-99-200)

Submitted: April 13, 2000

Decided: April 20, 2000

Before WIDENER and WILKINS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James Allen Lindner, Appellant Pro Se. Brian Lee Whisler, OFFICE
OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlotte, North Carolina, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, James Allen Lindner seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying his motion filed under 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 1999) and denying his application for a certificate of appealability. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeals on the reasoning of the district court. See United States v. Lindner, Nos. CR-97-308; CA-99-200 (W.D.N.C. Nov. 8 & Dec. 10, 1999).^{*} We also deny Lindner's motion to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED

^{*} Although the district court's order denying the § 2255 motion is marked as "filed" on November 5, 1999, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on November 8, 1999. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date the order was entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).